



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/686,426	10/11/2000	Justin Grant	MS158532.1	6062

27195 7590 02/10/2004

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER
1900 EAST NINTH STREET
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

KENNEDY, LESA M

[REDACTED] ART UNIT 2151 PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2004

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/686,426	GRANT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lesa Kennedy	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 October 2000.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 11 October 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2 .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the application filed October 11, 2000. Claims 1-25 are pending examination. Claims 1-25 represent a system and method directed towards event monitoring.

Specification

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it does not adequately describe the claimed subject matter, particularly, subject matter in the dependent claims. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because:

- a. Reference character “Member # 1 configuration settings” in Figure 2 has been designated in both Member #1 and Member #2.
- b. Reference character “Member # 2 configuration settings” is drawn residing in Member #3 in Figure 2.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informality:

The claim recites the limitation of “... the **configuration** consumer component ...” on line 1, however there was no reference to this configuration consumer component in the preceding claim. For purposes of further reviewing this claim, it will be assumed that the applicant intended to state “... the **event** consumer component ...”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-5, 7-9, 17-19, 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Connelly et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,594,786) in view of Jarriel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,553,403).

Connelly teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a system comprising agents to monitor cluster availability and configuration changes and report these events to a server (see abstract).

As to claim 1, Connelly teaches a system for monitoring events of a plurality of members configured as an entity, comprising:

at least one member of the entity having event logging settings for event types to be monitored (col. 5, lines 12-20; col. 6, lines 22-38; col. 14, lines 7-13; Connelly discloses that an HA server contains scripts for launching event monitoring agents (HA agents) in a cluster); and

each of the plurality of members of the entity having member specific configuration settings wherein event types in the at least one member is propagated to the member specific configuration settings of each of the plurality of members (col. 14, lines 7-13; Connelly discloses that the HA server automatically installs the HA agents on each system in the cluster).

Connelly fails to teach the limitation of the at least one member of the entity having configurable event logging settings for determining at least one of event types to be monitored.

However, Jarriel teaches a system and method for monitoring in a distributed computer network having a management server servicing a set of managed computers (see abstract).

Jarriel teaches the limitation of at least one member of the entity having configurable event logging settings for determining at least one of event types to be monitored (col. 6, lines 21-37; col. 8, lines 50-65; Jarriel discloses a system in which configurable event monitoring agents are dispatched from a central location throughout the network).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Connelly in view of Jarriel so as to allow for the modification of event monitoring activities. One would be motivated to do so to allow a user to select events to monitor depending on the type of resources being managed.

As to claim 2, the combination of Connelly in view of Jarriel teaches the invention substantially as claimed (see the rejection of claim 1 above).

The combination fails to teach the limitation wherein changes to the configurable event logging settings at the at least one member are dynamically updated at the member specific configuration settings of the plurality of remaining members.

However Jarriel teaches the limitation wherein changes to the configurable event logging settings at the at least one member are dynamically updated at the member specific configuration settings of the plurality of remaining members (col. 7, lines 1-6; Jarriel discloses that whenever an administrator configures a monitoring activity, software agents are dispatched to the monitored systems in the network).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Connelly in view of Jarriel so as to allow for the modification of event monitoring activities. One would be motivated to do so to allow a user to select events to monitor depending on the type of resources being managed.

As to claim 3, Connelly teaches the system of claim 1 wherein at least one of the plurality of members have an event monitor system operable to log event data information based on the member specific configuration settings (col. 7, lines 26-30; Connelly discloses that each HA agent comprises an event log).

As to claim 4, Connelly teaches the system of claim 3, wherein the event monitor system comprises an event consumer component operable to determine settings in the member specific configuration settings and log at least one of an event source, an event type and an event severity type based on the settings (col. 8, lines 13-21, 53; Table II; Connelly discloses that event source

(Source in Table II), event type (EventType in Table II) and event severity (Shutdown/Cause string in Table II) are logged in the event log).

As to claim 5, as best understood, the combination of Connelly in view of Jarriel teaches the invention substantially as claimed (see the rejection of claim 4 above).

The combination fails to teach the limitation of the configuration consumer component being notified of changes in the member specific configuration settings and being operable to access these changes through an event source.

However, Jarriel teaches the limitation of the configuration consumer component being notified of changes in the member specific configuration settings and being operable to access these changes (col. 7, lines 1-6; Jarriel discloses that whenever an administrator configures a monitoring activity, software agents are dispatched to the monitored systems in the network).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Connelly in view of Jarriel so as to allow for the modification of event monitoring activities. One would be motivated to do so to allow a user to select events depending on the type of resources being managed.

As to claim 7, the combination of Connelly in view of Jarriel teaches the invention substantially as claimed (see rejection of claim 1 above). Connelly teaches the limitation of the at least one member having event logging settings for determining event severity types to be monitored (col. 7, lines 43-52; Table I; Connelly discloses a list of causes used by the HA agents to determine the severity of a shutdown event).

Connelly fails to teach the limitation of the event logging settings being configurable.

Art Unit: 2151

However, Jarriel teaches the limitation of using configurable event logging settings (col. 6, lines 21-37; col. 8, lines 50-65; Jarriel discloses that configurable event monitoring agents are used in a network).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Connelly in view of Jarriel so as to allow for the modification of event monitoring activities. One would be motivated to do so to allow a user to select events to monitor depending on the type of resources being managed.

As to claim 8, Connelly teaches the system of claim 1, wherein each event is assigned a unique event identification number, a member identification number and an event time (col. 8, Table II; Connelly discloses that an event indicating a change in availability includes an event sequence number, event source and timestamp).

As to claim 9, Connelly teaches the system of claim 8, wherein event data common to all event types is logged in a first table and event data specific to the event instance is logged in a second table (col. 7, lines 31-42; col. 8, lines 13-21, 38-53; Connelly discloses that shutdown events (event specific data) are logged in the shutdown log and the related event data (event common data) are logged in the event log).

Claims 17-19 represent method claims that correspond to system claims 1, 7 and 2, respectively. They do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 1, 7 and 2, and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

Claims 21 and 23 represent means claims that correspond to system claims 1 and 2, respectively. They do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 1 and 2, and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

Claims 6 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Connelly et al. in view of Jarriel et al., and further in view of McHann (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,806).

As to claim 6, the combination of Connelly in view of Jarriel teaches the invention substantially as claimed (see rejection of claim 3 above).

The combination fails to teach the limitation of an event mapping component adapted to map different event types into a common data format.

However, McHann teaches a transactional event management structure that is implemented in a network computer system (see abstract). McHann teaches the limitation of mapping different event types into a common data format (col. 11, line 64 - col. 12, line 32; McHann discloses that event information is converted to a common format).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Connelly in view of Jarriel, in view of McHann so as to provide uniformity in collected event data. One would be motivated to do so to allow a user easily identify significant information.

Claim 22 represents a means claim that corresponds to system claims 6. It does not teach or define any new limitations above claim 6, and therefore is rejected for similar reasons.

Claims 10-14, 16, 20, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Connelly et al. in view of McHann (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,806).

As to claims 10 and 16, Connelly teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Connelly teaches the limitation of an event monitor system adapted to receive different event

Art Unit: 2151

types from an event source and log the different event types into a data store (col. 6, lines 31-51; Connelly discloses an HA server that receives events from HA agents on monitored systems, and logs the events in central data repository).

Connelly fails to teach the limitation of mapping data fields of the different event types into common data fields such that the different event types conform to a common event type schema.

However, McHann teaches the limitation of mapping different event types into a common data format (col. 11, line 64 - col. 12, line 32; McHann discloses that event information is converted to a common format).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Connelly in view of McHann so as to provide uniformity in collected event data. One would be motivated to do so to allow a user easily identify significant information.

As to claim 11, Connelly teaches the system of claim 10, wherein the event monitor system comprises an event consumer component operable to determine settings in the member specific configuration settings and log at least one of an event source, an event type and an event severity type based on the settings (col. 8, lines 13-21, 53; Table II; Connelly discloses that event source (Source in Table II), event type (EventType in Table II) and event severity (Shutdown/Cause string in Table II) are logged in the event log).

As to claim 12, Connelly teaches the system of claim 10, wherein each event is assigned a unique event identification number, a member identification number and an event time (col. 8, Table II; Connelly discloses that an event indicating a change in availability includes an event sequence number, event source and timestamp).

As to claim 13, Connelly teaches the system of claim 10, wherein event data common to event types is logged in a first table and event data unique to an event type instance being logged is logged in a second table (col. 7, lines 31-42; col. 8, lines 13-21, 38-53; Connelly discloses that shutdown events (unique event data) are logged in the shutdown log and the related event data (common event data) are logged in the event log).

As to claim 14, Connelly teaches the system of claim 10, wherein the event types comprise at least one of operating system events, entity events and health monitor events (col. 8, lines 38-53; Connelly discloses monitoring events related changes in the configuration of a system (system event) or cluster (entity event)).

Claim 20 represents a method claim that corresponds to system claim 16. It does not teach or define any new limitations above claim 16, and therefore is rejected for similar reasons.

Claim 24 represents a means claim that corresponds to system claims 16. It does not teach or define any new limitations above claim 16, and therefore is rejected for similar reasons.

As to claim 25, Connelly teaches the system of claim 24, comprising means for merging event data specific to an event occurrence into event data common to the event (col. 7, lines 43-52; col. 10, lines 44-50; Connelly discloses that all unplanned shutdown, availability and configuration events from an HA agent are collected in the HA server's event repository to construct a history events).

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Connelly et al. in view of McHann, and further in view of Jarriel et al.

As to claim 15, the combination of Connelly in view of McHann teaches the invention substantially as claimed (see rejection of claim 10 above).

The combination teaches the limitation of logging event common data and event data specific to the instance of the event upon receipt of a new event (col. 7, lines 31-42; col. 8, lines 13-21, 38-53; Connelly discloses that shutdown events (unique event data) are logged in the shutdown log and the related event data (common event data) are logged in the event log).

The combination fails to teach the limitation of logging only event data specific to the instance of the event upon receipt of a reoccurrence of an event.

However, Jarriel teaches the use of correlation rules to handle reoccurring events (col. 10, lines 43-46; Jarriel discloses specifying rules to ignore duplicate events).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Connelly in view of McHann, in view of Jarriel so as to ignore reoccurring event data that does not provide information specific to each occurrence of the event. One would be motivated to do so to reduce event flow traffic.

Remarks

7. Claims 4-7, 11, 14-15, 18 contain improper sentence structure. To improve the clarity of the claims, it is recommended that applicant inserts the word "wherein" after the claim number in each of these claims.

Art Unit: 2151

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lesa Kennedy whose telephone number is (703) 305-8865. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Lesa Kennedy
Art Unit 2151

Andrew Caldwell
Andrew Caldwell